

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-15 are pending. The independent claims are system claim 1, mobile terminal claims 3 and 10, and method claim 14.

Independent claims 1, 3, and 14 are rejected as being obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) from *Pivowar #1* (U.S. Patent No. 6,553,037) in view of *Pivowar #2* (U.S. Patent No. 6,466,236).

Independent claim 10 is rejected as being obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) from *Pivowar #1* (U.S. Patent No. 6,553,037) in view of *Pivowar #2* (U.S. Patent No. 6,466,236) and *Namikata* (U.S. Patent No. 5,996,003).

#### **Independent Claim 1 is Not Obvious**

*Pivowar #1* discusses that calendar information may be stored and updated on a plurality of PDAs (see column 5, lines 44-60). This paragraph of *Pivowar #1* does not suggest that a slave terminal is able to display a calendar document that is controlled by a master terminal, “as the master terminal manipulates or updates” the document. This quoted feature is claimed by present claim 1, and is a critical aspect of the present invention. The slave terminal is able to view the document as the master terminal updates it.

Because this feature is not suggested by the material in columns 4 or 5 of *Pivowar #1*, applicant assumes that paragraph 2 of the Office Action is relying upon the material incorporated at lines 56-60 in column 5 of *Pivowar #1*. That incorporated patent provides further information about synchronization of shared calendar data, and that incorporated patent is referred to herein as *Pivowar #3* (U.S. Patent No. 6,308,201). However, the paragraph at column 5, lines 44-60 of *Pivowar #1* is completely identical to the paragraph at column 5, lines 39-56 of *Pivowar #3*, and applicant does not perceive that anything in *Pivowar #3* teaches or suggests that a slave terminal is able to display a calendar document that is controlled by a master terminal, “as the master terminal manipulates or updates” the document.

The Office Action does not contend that this important feature of the present claimed invention is disclosed or suggested by *Pivowar #2*, and since this feature is absent from *Pivowar #1* and from *Pivowar #3* incorporated therein, it is respectfully submitted that present claim 1 is not obvious from the references cited. Of course, to establish a *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. MPEP § 2143.03. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that the non-final Office Action has not made out a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

In order to more fully understand the substantial differences between *Pivowar #1* and the present claimed invention, Applicant would further point out that none of the cited portions of *Pivowar #1* establish the present claimed master-slave relationship. *Pivowar #1* vaguely refers to addressing conflicts between calendars, at column 5, lines 50-51. Such conflicts have usually been addressed in the prior art by exchanging calendar information after it has been stored or updated on each PDA, and *Pivowar #1* suggests nothing new in this regard (see column 5, lines 44-55). Thus, two different PDAs will create calendars, and then exchange that calendar information, and used the exchanged information to modify their own respective calendars to avoid the conflict, but then when the modified calendars are exchanged then there is no assurance that the modifications will not conflict. Thus, the present claimed invention allows the slave terminal to actually view the master terminal's calendar as it is being modified (thus enabling the slave terminal to send real time comments to the master terminal). This real time view is a vast improvement over prior art techniques such as that described in the three *Pivowar* patents.

Regarding *Pivowar #2*, the Office Action refers to column 2, lines 8-13 and also refers to column 5, lines 33-40. However, *Pivowar #2* does not deal with a document that is exclusively controlled by a master terminal (as presently claimed), but instead deals with a document that is edited by multiple users. Moreover, *Pivowar #2* does not suggest that a non-editing user will be able to view the document as it is being edited by an editing user. The material at column 5, lines 33-40 of *Pivowar #2* says that "while the calendars are being

displayed,” the user may modify various calendar aspects, but there is no suggestion that another user would be able to observe this process, much less that the other user would be a slave terminal unable to modify the calendar.

### **Independent Claims 3, 10 and 14 are Not Obvious**

Page 3 of the Office Action says that independent claims 3 and 14 are rejected for the same reasons as independent claim 1. Therefore Applicant respectfully traverses those rejections for the same reasons described above with respect to claim 1. Applicant also points out that claim 3 includes important additional features that are not addressed in the non-final Office Action. For example, claim 3 specifies that the mobile terminal receives an external document manipulation signal which manipulates an externally controlled shared document. In other words, claim 1 only claimed an internally controlled shared document, whereas claim 3 claims a combination of both an internally shared document and an externally controlled shared document. This important feature of present claim 3 has not been addressed by the Office Action.

Page 5 of the Office Action says that independent claim 10 is rejected for the same reasons as for claim 3, plus additional reasons related to the *Namikata* reference. To the extent that the rejection of claim 10 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 3, it is noted that claim 3 was rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, and therefore Applicant again respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 10 for the same reasons described above with respect to claim 1.

Regarding the *Namikata* reference, that reference is cited against pending independent claim 10, but is not cited against the other three independent claims. The Office Action points to FIG 1 of *Namikata*, but Applicant respectfully points out that *Namikata*'s FIG 1 illustrates a system wherein a transmitting side transmits a signal 20 to a receiving side. In contrast, present claim 10 claims a single terminal 12a rather than a system, and so *Namikata*'s FIG 1 is inherently different from the terminal of present claim 10. Also, present claim 10 claims two

different types of documents: an externally controlled shared document, and an internally controlled shared document, whereas *Namikata* does not make this distinction. In other words, the “document” in *Namikata*’s transmitting side 100 is the same “document” in *Namikata*’s receiving side 200. This is another important difference between the present claimed invention and the cited references.


### CONCLUSION

Early allowance of claims 1-15 is earnestly solicited. Applicant would be grateful if the Examiner would please contact Applicant’s attorney by telephone if the Examiner detects anything in the present response that might hinder a speedy allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 18, 2004

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER  
SLUYS & ADOLPHSON LLP  
Building Five, Bradford Green  
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224  
Monroe, CT 06468  
Telephone: (203) 261-1234  
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676  
USPTO Customer No. 004955

  
Andrew T. Hyman  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 45,858